REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated January 10, 2008.

Claims 12, 13, 15, 19, 37-39, 41-58, 60-70, 72-79, and 83-87 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 5-6, and 12-87 remain pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 5, 12-17, 19, 37-39, 41-58, 60-70, 72-79 and 83-87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims were amended to address the rejection. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 5, 15-18, 20-30, 33-34, 36-37, 39-50, 55-57, 59-69, 71-72, 74-75 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,945) in view of Hurvig (U.S. Patent No. 5,628,005).

Carter is directed at providing a hybrid database that combines the features of commercial databases and source code control systems (Carter, 2: 48-50). The Office action cites the resident database that contains the first master file group (Carter, 3: 52-57) to show the stored data set recited in claim 1. The Office action concedes, however, that Carter does not disclose a data set that includes an unlocked data set being available for modification. (Detailed description, page 5.) Thus, even if Carter discloses a data set in the form of a master file group, Carter fails to disclose or suggest the specific type of a data set recited in claim 1 that includes both locked and unlocked data - namely, "a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system **to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set**, the stored data set

being stored in memory, the unlocked data set being available for modification and the locked data set being protected from modification."

In order to show a stored data set to include an unlocked data set being available for modification, the Office action cites Hurvig that is directed at a system and method that provides an access control list (ACL) that spans across object boundaries in an object oriented database (Hurvig, Abstract). Specifically, the Office action points out that the server illustrated in Figure 4 stores a modifiable database (Detailed action, page 5). Thus, while Hurvig describes a master file group, Hurvig, even if combined with Carter, also fails to disclose or suggest the specific type of a data set recited in claim 1 that includes **both locked and unlocked data**. The combination of Carter and Hurvig, thus, does not teach "a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system **to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set**, the stored data set being stored in memory, the unlocked data set being available for modification and the locked data set being protected from modification."

Furthermore, the Office action did not address the operations performed on the above-mentioned type of a data set. Specifically, the Office action discussed transmitting only the locked data set to the first entity and transmitting only the unlocked data set to the first entity, but did not discuss the operation recited in claim 1 - "transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity," where the locked data set and the unlocked data set are both included in the same data set.

Moreover, it is submitted that the operation of "reversing" recited in claim 1 is performed with respect to "the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity" that are both from the same data set, which is distinct from an operation performed on just the unlocked data set or an operation performed just on the locked data set. Hurvig and Carter, whether considered separately or in combination, do not disclose or suggest either a data set that includes both locked and unlocked data, or a possibility of performing operations on a data set that includes both locked and unlocked data. Thus, the combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest a method comprising "defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reversing the locked data set and the

unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification," as recited in claim 1. Because the combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 40 recites instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "define a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmit the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reverse the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification." Claim 40, therefore and its dependent claims are patentable in view of the combination of Carter and Hurvig for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

The combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest a method comprising "receiving, from a first entity of a computer system, a copy of a master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data and being stored in memory, the received copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the unlocked data in the master data set and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set," as recited in claim 33. Because the combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 33, claim 33 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed.

The combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest "transmitting a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to locked data in the master data set in the first entity," as recited in claim 20. Because the

combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 20, claim 20 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed.

The combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "transmit a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set in the first entity," as recited in claim 59. Because the combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 59, claim 59 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed.

The combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "receive, from a first entity, a copy of a master data set with permissions for using the master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the first permissions allowing changes to the unlocked data and access but no changes to the locked data, the permissions-indicating operations that may be performed on the unlocked locked data and applications that the second entity may use for manipulating the unlocked data, the received copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set in the first entity," as recited in claim 71. Because the combination of Carter and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest all elements of claim 71, claim 71 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 12-14, 19, 31-32, 38, 51-53, 58, 70 and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,945) and Hurvig (U.S. Patent No. 5,628,005) in view of Fabbio (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,346).

Fabbio is directed at a system and method that provides an access control list (ACL) that spans across object boundaries in an object oriented database (Fabbio, Abstract). Fabbio,

whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest "transmitting a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to locked data in the master data set in the first entity. These operations are included in claims 12-14 and 19 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 1. Because the combination of Fabbio, Carter, and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest "defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reversing the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification" included in claims 12-14 and 19 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 1, claims 12-14 and 19 are patentable and should be allowed.

Fabbio, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest "transmitting a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to locked data in the master data set in the first entity." These operations are included in claims 31-32 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 20. Thus, claims 31-32 are patentable and should be allowed.

Fabbio, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest "receiving, from a first entity of a computer system, a copy of a master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data and being stored in memory, the received copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the unlocked data in the master data set and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked

data in the master data set." These operations are included in claim 38 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 33. Thus, claim 38 is patentable and should be allowed.

Fabbio, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest "define a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmit the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reverse the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification." These operations are included in claims 51-53 and 58 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 40. Because the combination of Fabbio, Carter, and Hurvig fails to disclose or suggest "defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reversing the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification" included in claims 51-53 and 58 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 40, claims 51-53 and 58 are patentable and should be allowed.

Fabbio, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "transmit a copy of the master data set with indications of the permissions to the second entity, the transmitted copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the transmitted copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set in the first entity." These features are included in claim 70 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 59. Thus, claim 70 is patentable and should be allowed.

Fabbio, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "receive, from a first entity, a copy of a master data set with permissions for using the master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the first permissions allowing changes to the

unlocked data and access but no changes to the locked data, the permissions-indicating operations that may be performed on the unlocked locked data and applications that the second entity may use for manipulating the unlocked data, the received copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set in the first entity." These features are included in claim 76 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 71. Thus, claim 76 is patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 6, 35, 45, 73 and 78-87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,945) in view of Hurvig (U.S. Patent No. 5,628,005) as applied to claims 1, 20, 33, 40, 59 and 71, and further in view of Sweeney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,715).

Sweeney is directed at a user management system that allows permissive access to applications and stored procedures and a version control management system which ensures a user is using the desired or current version of an application. (Sweeney, Abstract.)

Sweeney, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "defining a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmitting the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reversing the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification." These features are included in claim 6 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 1. Thus, claim 6 is patentable and should be allowed.

Sweeney, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "receiving, from a first entity of a computer system, a copy of a master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data and being stored in memory, the received copy of the master data set

including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the unlocked data in the master data set and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set." These features are included in claim 35 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 33. Thus, claim 35 is patentable and should be allowed.

Sweeney, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "define a stored data set maintained by a first entity of a computer system to include a locked data set and an unlocked data set...; transmit the locked data set and the unlocked data set to a second entity; and reverse the locked data set and the unlocked data set at the second entity, such that the locked data set becomes an unlocked data set being available for modification and the unlocked data set becomes a locked data set being protected from modification." These features are included in claim 45 by virtue of its being dependent on claim 40. Thus, claim 45 is patentable and should be allowed.

Sweeney, whether considered separately or in combination with Carter and Hurvig, fails to disclose or suggest instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to "receive, from a first entity, a copy of a master data set with permissions for using the master data set, the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the first permissions allowing changes to the unlocked data and access but no changes to the locked data, the permissions-indicating operations that may be performed on the unlocked locked data and applications that the second entity may use for manipulating the unlocked data, the received copy of the master data set including locked and unlocked data, the locked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to unlocked data in the master data set in the first entity and the unlocked data in the received copy of the master data set corresponding to the locked data in the master data set in the first entity." These features are included in claims 73 and 78-87 by virtue of their being dependent on claim 71. Thus, claims 73 and 78-87 are patentable and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at 408-278-4042 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
408-278-4042

Date 04-09-08

By 
Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 9th day of April 2008.

Dawn R. Shaw — Dawn R. Shaw

Name — Signature